



2674

PATENT
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 049128-5042

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| In re Application of: |) | |
| Yong Sung HAM |) | Confirmation No.: 8126 |
| Application No.: 09/993,522 |) | Group Art Unit: 2674 |
| Filed: November 27, 2001 |) | Examiner: X. Wu |
| For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR |) | |
| DRIVING LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY |) | |

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

1. Transmitted herewith is a Request for Reconsideration responding to the Office Action dated February 8, 2005.
2. Additional papers enclosed:
 - ☐ Drawings: ☐ Formal ☐ Informal (Correction)
 - ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
 - ☐ Form PTO-1449, _____ references included
 - ☐ Citations
 - ☐ Declaration of Biological Deposit
 - ☐ Submission of "Sequence Listing", computer readable copy and/or amendment pertaining thereto for biotechnology invention containing nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence.

3. Extension of Time

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) apply.

☒ Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicants have inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

☐ Applicants petition for an extension of time, the fees for which are set out in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a), for the total number of months checked below:

| <u>Total Months Requested</u> | <u>Fee for Extension</u> | <u>[Fee for Small Entity]</u> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> one month | \$ 120.00 | \$ 60.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> two months | \$ 450.00 | \$ 225.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> three months | \$ 1,020.00 | \$ 510.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> four months | \$ 1,590.00 | \$ 795.00 |

Extension of time fee due with this request: \$

If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a Petition therefor.

☐ An extension for _____ months has already been secured and the fee paid therefor of \$_____ is deducted from the total fee due for the total months of extension now requested.

4. Constructive Petition

☒ EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

5. Fee Calculation (37 C.F.R. §1.16)

| CLAIMS AS AMENDED | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| | Claims Remaining After Amendment | | Highest No. Previously Paid | Present Extra | at Rate of | Total Fees |
| Total Claims (37 C.F.R. §1.16(c)) | 21 | minus | 21 | 0 | x \$50 each= | + \$ |
| Independent Claims (37 C.F.R. §1.16(b)) | 6 | minus | 6 | 0 | x \$200 each= | + \$0.00 |
| [] First presentation of Multiple dependent claim(s) | | | | | \$360.00 | + \$ |
| SUB-TOTAL = | | | | | | \$0.00 |
| Reduction by ½ for filing by a small entity | | | | | | - \$ |
| TOTAL FEE = | | | | | | \$0.00 |

6. Fee Payment

- ☒ No fee is to be paid at this time.
- ☐ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the amount of \$____, to Deposit Account No. 50-0310.
- ☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: May 9, 2005

By:

Collin W. Park
Collin W. Park
Registration No. 43,378

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001



PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 049128-5042

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| In re Application of: |) | |
| |) | |
| Yong Sung HAM |) | Confirmation No.: 8126 |
| |) | |
| Application No.: 09/993,522 |) | Group Art Unit: 2674 |
| |) | |
| Filed: November 27, 2001 |) | Examiner: X. Wu |
| |) | |
| For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR |) | |
| DRIVING LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY |) | |

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

In response to the Office Action dated February 8, 2005, the period for response to which extends through May 9, 2005 (May 8, 2005 being a Sunday), applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending rejections and objections, and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-21 are currently pending.

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16-18, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sawada (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,317).

Claims 3-6, 11-15 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 3-6, 11-14 and 19 would be allowable as noted at paragraph 4 of the pending Office Action.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 7-10, 15-18, 20 and 21 are allowable for at least the reasons detailed below. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-6, 11-14 and 19, which respectively depend from claims 1, 8, 10 and 17, are allowable at least for the same reasons.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16-18, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sawada.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sawada does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16-18, 20 and 21 because Sawada does not disclose every feature of these recited claims.

With respect to independent claim 1, Sawada fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least “detecting a driving frequency of video image data for a current frame,” and “adjusting the reference modulated data in accordance with the detected driving frequency to modulate the video image data.”

With respect to independent claim 8, Sawada fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least “detecting a driving frequency of video image data,” “determining the frequency band including the detected driving frequency,” and “assigning a weighting value of the frequency band including the driving frequency to the reference modulated data to adjust the reference modulated data, thereby modulating the video image data.”

With respect to independent claims 10 and 20, Sawada fails to teach or suggest the claimed combinations, including at least “a mode detector detecting a driving frequency of current video image data” and “a modulator selecting reference modulated data from previously registered data and adjusting the selected reference modulated data in accordance with the detected driving frequency.”

With respect to independent claim 17, Sawada fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least “a mode detector detecting a driving frequency of current video image data” and “a modulator selecting reference modulated data from previously registered data, setting a different weighting value for each frequency band having a plurality of frequency ranges, and assigning a weighting value of the frequency band including the detected frequency to the reference modulated data.”

With respect to independent claim 21, Sawada fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least “a mode detector detecting a driving frequency of current video image data” and “a modulator selecting reference modulated data, setting a different weighting value for each frequency band having a plurality of frequency ranges and assigning a weighting value of the frequency band including the detected frequency of the reference modulated data.”

With respect to independent claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 20, and 21, the Office appears to rely on items 14, 15, and/or 17 of Fig. 1 of Sawada as allegedly performing “detecting a driving frequency of video image data for a current frame” (claim 1), “detecting a driving frequency of video image data” (claim 8), or “detecting a driving frequency of current image data” (claims 10, 17, 20, and 21). Office Action, pages 2-4. However, nowhere does Sawada teach or suggest “detecting a driving frequency of video image data.” In fact, Sawada clearly discloses in Fig. 1

and associated text that items 14, 15, and/or 17 in Fig. 1 merely receive synchronizing signals as inputs and do not even receive “video image data” as an input, much less detect “a driving frequency of video image data.” Furthermore, at least because Sawada fails to teach or suggest “detecting a driving frequency of video image data,” it also fails to teach or suggest “adjusting the reference modulated data in accordance with the detected driving frequency . . .” (claims 1, 10, and 20) or “assigning a weighting value of the frequency band including the driving frequency to the reference modulated data” (claims 8, 17, and 20).

In the response to Applicant’s previous arguments, the Office appears to rely on low pass filters 33, 34, and 35 shown in Fig. 2 (which are part of item 14) of Sawada as allegedly “detecting a driving frequency of video image data.” Office Action, pages 4-5. This appears inconsistent with the body of the rejection, where the Office, with respect to all independent claims except claim 1, relies on item 15 of Fig. 1 in Sawada as allegedly “detecting a driving frequency of video image data.” In any event, Sawada discloses in Fig. 2 and associated text that these LPFs 33, 34, and 35 merely receive a horizontal synchronizing signal as an input and do not even receive “video image data” as inputs, much less detect “a driving frequency of video image data.” Hence, Sawada fails to teach or suggest “detecting a driving frequency of video image data.”

At least based on the reasons detailed above, Sawada fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 20, and 21. With no other rejection pending, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable. Further, claims 2-7, 9, 11-16, 18, and 19 each depend from one of these independent claims and therefore are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all pending claims. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: May 9, 2005

By: Collin W. Park
Collin W. Park
Registration No. 43,378

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001